DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 610 TE 001 993

AUTHOR Hobgood, Burnet M.
TITLE The Status of Theatre Education: Five Problems.
PUB DATE 68
NOTE 19p.; Speech delivered at the annual convention of the American Educational Theatre Association, August, 1968, Los Angeles

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.05
DESCRIPTORS Creative Development, *Curriculum Development, Drama, Educational Facilities, *Educational Objectives, Educational Programs, Laboratory Training, Research, Self Actualization, Student Development, Teacher Experience, Teacher Qualifications, *Theater Arts

ABSTRACT

In order that theatre education may contribute significantly to theatre art and to society, five problems must be examined: (1) the qualifications of individual instructors and the quality of theatre programs; (2) the need for a good laboratory program "to teach theatre and let theatre teach," with play production serving only as an extension of the educational process; (3) the identification of theatre as a unique art demanding study suited to it (one result being a revitalized understanding of theatre research); (4) the development of a student-centered program whereby the pupil achieves disciplined creativity by progressing through four stages--initiatory, formative, productive, and creative; and (5) the promotion of the concept that theatre education is a necessary part of a complete education for the child, the adolescent, and the young adult. (JMC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE STATUS OF THEATRE EDUCATION

Five Problems

By Burnet M. Hobgood
Southern Methodist University
Dallas, Texas

ED043610

This is a crucial time for theatre education. As an academic field, it has sufficient breadth and depth that it must recognize the absolute necessity to become more responsible for what it has created, the more so as it appears entirely possible and probable that destiny threatens to award it an unaccustomed role of leadership.

Our situation calls for re-examination. A general awareness of this came to be felt a few years ago when one after another of the leading programs in universities, schools,and community theatres instituted self-studies which led to reorganization and, in some cases, to total revisions of practice. In the colleges a trend for more specialization of the curriculum occurred and striking innovations were introduced as a result of reappraisals. Federal and state subsidies were available for the first time, and it did not take an alert observer to notice that these funds, as well as those of foundations, repeatedly went to persons and programs which wished to test new possibilities or question old hypotheses.

TE 000 043

I have been attending theatre conferences for twenty years, and I am depressed by the realization that I have heard and learned very little about these developments at those meetings. Until recently I saw little heed to theatre education in publications, and much of what I heard and read was either uninspired or exclamatory.

A genuine re-examination asks us to be rational and candid about the problems we face. Our response to these problems in the next years and months will very

probably determine the future shape of theatre education for once and all. If we avoid these problems or do not confront them with energy, the concepts that theatre education represents will eventually fail of significance.

I want to reconnoiter some of the problems that appear now to need careful study and thought, making some suggestions which may provoke further inquiry. My topics will be: Pluralism and Professionalism, Public Relations and the Laboratory, Theatre qua Theatre, The Development of Talent, and Missionary Work--or Who's Got the Marbles in the Education Game?

Pluralism and Professionalism

The overriding issue in the educational theatre of the Sixties is that of quality. Reports on the extent of theatre education have surprised and satisfied, alarmed and stimulated their readers

> [See Directory of American College Theatre, 2nd Ed. (AFTA); Directory of Children's Theatres (AETA); Theater in America (NTC and Dembar Research Services)]

while establishing certain facts. Among the most important points that this research has made is the diversity of the field; uniformity of approach and practice does not exist, and the diversity is great enough that we should expect pluralism to continue to be the rule. Even programs which share similar convictions know disagreement over some matters. And so, in pressing for the qualitative progress of theatre education, we must accept this pluralism, rather than advocating one way or another as the best or only way to skin the cat. After all, it is the calibre of what is done and its lasting impact which matters.

I am not an apologist for the one-man operation, but some years ago I had the opportunity to observe the work of a gifted colleague laboring alone in a

college theatre. He did everything and did most of it with excellence. His students' preparation for future work was superior to that provided by most departments with a larger staff, and his productions compared favorably too. He possessed the quintessential skill of the good teacher: turning limitations into advantages. One cannot cite many examples like this, but one bona fide example destroys any assumption that only an elaborate program in theatre provides adequate instruction and training.

The selfless energy and dedicated professionalism of this teacher made all the difference. Admittedly, I took exception to several of his methods, although I would never deny the efficacy of the experience he gave his students. Now when it comes to quality in theatre education, this is the nub of the whole issue. We can view the proliferation of theatres in schools without alarm if we can produce instructors of zeal and professionalism. But we are woefully prepared to profit from this realization.

The teaching of theatre is a rather unique vocation, in that its demands are so various--except in instances where instructors can be permitted to concentrate their endeavors in specialized areas (even there it is taxing). Summed up, the good teacher is an imaginative, thoroughly trained practitioner in theatre and a person fully committed to education; only those with these qualifications deserve recognition as professionals in theatre education. If this is so, there are hundreds of amateurs fouling the nest.

Yet how specific can we be beyond this generalization about qualifications? Well, that summary says nothing about academic degrees. Nor does it assure that a trained professional, with or without degrees, can teach. If there is an implication that the individual's experience should be restricted to educational theatre,

let us scotch that idea as myopic. But, while I imagine we could secure majority agreement to that summary as a proposition, I don't think we really know what it means. Perhaps Frank Barron and his colleagues (at the Institute for Personality Assessment, Berkeley) could find out what it means, if we could get them to investigate it. Certainly one practical approach would be to identify some excellent theatre teachers and then explore their work and backgrounds for explanations of their worth; it could develop that the qualities discovered might be of a kind that could not be inculcated, but at least we could know that much.

> A qualification: One should keep a clear distinction between effective administrators and good teachers. I happen to be one of those unfortunates who administers and teaches, and I am positive that the functions are entirely dissimilar.

The import of my suggestion may be clear, but it needs spelling out. In a field like theatre it is ethically questionable to let loose an unqualified instructor, to do violence to the sensibilities of his students and co-workers. It is possible to assume too much too easily. We should establish grounds for assumptions that have an ethical bearing; our neglect to do so is a comment on what we are and may be.

Concern over the qualifications of the individual teacher should be matched by concern over entire programs at any institution. Happily, our Association has moved forward in this, through the inception of the Standing Committee on Standards in Educational Theatre, which completes its pilot evaluations of college and university theatres this fall. Its procedure for evaluation will then have been tested and subjected to review, before being made available to all colleges and universities (and eventually to programs in other situations where criteria have been developed by responsible and representative bodies). To put it with complete candor, the object of such program evaluation is the same as that of the accrediting services recognized by the National Commission on Accrediting:

to protect the public from programs which are not what they seem or which fail to meet or surpass fundamental criteria.

Evaluation procedures for programs in theatre, when voluntarily entered into by educational institutions, will go far to establish the professionalism of this field. How else we may defend the right to individuality of departments while meeting the challenge to improve the quality of theatre education, is difficult to see.

Public Relations and the Laboratory

At one time it would have been unthinkable to ask an educational theatre to justify its production of plays. Production was the raison d'etre of the school theatre: it was an appropriate and stimulating extra-class activity, an enriching recreation for the particular school's community and had greater influence by virtue of that community's witnessing the efforts of fellow students and faculty to interpret dramatic works of substance or some fame. But the day when play production was its own justification is done for the serious theatre teacher. Merely recreational purposes furnish an inadequate basis for the staging of drama in theatre education. Within its frame of reference, play production must be an extension of the educational process. When the justification of a program is to teach theatre and to let theatre teach, recreational purposes for play production are unsuitable and attenuate the educational values to be served.

Does such a position deny a place to play production for its own sake in the college, high school, community, or children's theatre? So long as recreational productions are clearly identified, it need not. But producing a play in the name of theatre education is to engage in a kind of public laboratory, the ideas of the classroom being put to the test before the peers of students

and teachers together with interested members of the community. The difference between the two sorts of production becomes evident when we point out that an enthusiastic popular reception marks the success of the former, whereas the recognition of substantive, artistic values measures the success of the latter. In a laboratory one learns as much or more from apparent failure as from apparent success.

The argument is familiar, but we notice neglect in the observance of its import. The seasons announced by educational theatres frequently make distressing reading; the annual report in the Educational Theatre Journal on college theatre seasons would be incomplete without the author's lament at the dominance of ordinary entertainment fare. It may be that many of these theatres publish program notes along with their productions of Mary, Mary or The Sound of Music which go something like: "We're taking a vacation to offer this piece of trivia just for the hell of it"--but I doubt it. One has to conclude that the public relations consideration, by which I mean the hunger for popular success, intrudes upon the laboratory in too many instances.

But that is not the only problem. Uncomfortable though it may be, we have to ask: How justifiable is an inept laboratory? That is to say, if the purpose is "play production as a learning experience," what profit derives from incompetence? The answer is obvious and the question is not just rhetorical. An embarrassing number of productions in the educational theatre lack merit; to be specific, the acting and directing in many of them can only be deplored. The worst of it is that the perpretators of these offenses can remain oblivious to their faults.

I know very well that I am treading sensitive ground. Still, the gravity of the problem of production standards in theatre education inspires the thought, Can anything be done about it? The source of the problem ought to be understood before anything can be done.

In a very distinct fashion the campus or school playhouse becomes an island unto itself, operating by its own standards which tend to be self-tolerating and unaffected by the judgments of competent persons from other situations. The producers of the educational theatre hear few critiques--that they must heed, except from persons whose bias and adequacy to evaluate may be suspect; commentary probably will be celebrated when it is assuring and quickly dismissed when it is disturbing. A new type of criticism needs to be introduced into this situation.

We can hope that the American College Theatre Festival will be a force for the better and that the Association's Committee on Standards will be a helpful influence. Other possibilities come to mind: the regular exchange of productions among educational theatres within a region, an increasing use of resident artists, development of more knowledgeable critics, the example of resident professional companies (although Julius Novick's recent assessment of them makes one wonder). A more exciting idea has come out of the resident theatre movement: a professional touring company for a state or region, which plays through the regular season for schools and communities and reverts to stock company status during the summer months. It has been done in several places; it could render many benefits.

Undeniably, it is desirable to find means to raise the standards of production, to discourage the tendency to endanger theatre education's laboratory by yielding to the appetite for better public relations. If our school administrations mean to support theatre education, they will see to it that the laboratory is protected.

Theatre qua Theatre

A central problem in theatre education today is its inheritance of expediency. For theatre did not enter the structure of American higher education by the front

door; in most cases it did not even come in by the side door or the back door--it sneaked in through the basement. Being a clever zanni, it soon earned the right to occupy a place in the servants' quarters where it could watch enviously when the structure was enlarged to provide for interesting newcomers (many of whom entered by the front door). Then, suddenly, this zanni had an invitation to take possession of an apartment newly made for it, and to assume an equal status with the other respectable inhabitants in the larger structure. It accepted the invitation happily, if self-consciously. When this happened, it had to decide how to conduct itself. Should it continue the accustomed attitude of accommodation that helped to earn its new place? How about the used furniture of the servant quarters?--take it along or leave it behind? The zanni was an actor having to learn how to play a new type of role, wanting to erase unsuitable characteristics and yet hesitant to abandon the sure-fire.

The moral of this little tale is the ambivalence of theatre education in declaring its identity. The assumptions and policies of the field reveal a potent dependence on emulating practices followed with profit in non-arts fields of study. The rationale for this attitude is the implicit presumption that the orthodox methods for building curriculums and courses in other subject matters should aid the study of theatre. Now we must wonder if that ambivalence is still necessary.

An interesting, but overlooked fact in the history of art criticism and theory is the altered status of drama and theatre as a source and reference in the origination of new principles. Through the rise of Romanticism the most significant thinkers on the arts, from Plato to Hegel, drew heavily upon their experience of the theatre in formulating influential propositions about art, and commonly joined Lessing in esteeming drama and theatre as even the highest

form of artistic expression. After Romanticism critics and philosophers turned their attention increasingly to matters of style and import, which tended to give greater focus to the literary, visual, and musical forms of art. Curiously enough, dramatic criticism and theatre teaching reflects these later emphases, when one would expect it to draw on the older tradition. This accords with the emulation of other academic fields in classroom work.

If we are searching for orthodox bases, however, doesn't it make sense to proclaim a new orthodoxy drawn from the older tradition? What I have in mind is an orthodoxy founded on the premise that the theatre is an important and complex art of intrinsic interest and social value which demands thorough study by means uniquely suited to it. An impressive company of contemporary thinkers beckons to us to adopt this attitude.

> (Elder Olson, Francis Fergusson, Susanne K. Langer, Eric Bentley, etc.)

It entails going so far as to reject the assumptions in the mainstream of post-Romantic criticism and thought as actually heterodox, so far as serious theatre study is concerned. I mean by this the discrediting of implications that the theatre is a derivative form of expression, whose function is to interpret literary art; that acting amounts to nothing more than a species of "let's pretend" which any sophomore can master with some advice on standard stage behavior; that the elaborate technology of the theatre is mere craft worthy of only passing attention.

To my mind a high school teacher of theatre put the issue most forcibly when, after a spirited debate on teaching methods with a spokesman for non-theatre values, she said: "They want me to be ashamed of the theatre, and I'm not. It is the most glorious form of art, and I intend to teach it as theatre, not as a poor cousin of literature or history."

What might be the consequences of pursuing such a policy? I will take time to point out one: A revitalized concept of research. The notion is prompted by the excellent studies we have recently seen by historians like Alan Donner, Charles Shattuck, Kalman Burnim, and others, in which they plumbed the prompt books and memorabilia of great theatre figures in the past to reconstruct an idea of how these men worked. Why do we not extend our concept of research to comprehend contemporary studies of this kind, not just of celebrated practitioners but of the theatre event as we participate in it ourselves? In recent issues of the ETJ, Editor Francis Hodge has given us glimpses of the creative bases for exemplary productions; other journals have done this too, notably Encore and TDR. As I have enjoyed studying these examples of what I've come to term "production research," I have thought of the quickly forgotten labor and study that actors and directors have devoted to the creation of roles and staging--deciding that this previously unrecognized type of study needs to be acknowledged as "performance research" and deserves our thoughtful scrutiny. (I'll warrant that more of us benefited from Kenneth Tynan's piece on Olivier's Othello than from most other articles on that play.) Long ago Stanislavski called upon the men and women of the theatre to assert their prerogative of examining their art and craft rather than simply continuing to exploit it; in following his own advice, he became the most important teacher the theatre has known.

The textbooks produced for our use indirectly speak to the problem. So many of them are tidy reorganizations of what John Dolman or Alexander Dean put forward a generation ago for another kind of theatre than we see today. We ought to be questioning the venerable hypotheses of the Stanislavskis, Dolmans, and Deans, re-examining with our students their postulates and recommendations in the light of the contemporary theatre experience, instead of passing them on as received gospel. Particularly do the creative phases of theatre--acting,

directing, playwriting, and design--require fresh approaches under a broadened concept of research.

The stodgy, unimaginative curriculums of college and university departments stand in dire need of reform before they bore or mislead more students. In typical course sequences that we found in twice surveying all of the classes taught in college and university theatre departments for the Directory of American College Theatre, we got familiar with this sort of structure: "Basic" Something, "intermediate" Something, and "Advanced" Something--paralleled on the graduate level by "Seminar in" Something and "Problems in" Something. Presumably Professor Somebody presides over this ill-defined sequence which, according to my interviews with students, becomes easier as one goes along. I realize that this is a pattern borrowed from foreign language study, where the increasing difficulty of thinking in another tongue removes the need for precision in specifying course objectives; it seems overly ambiguous in theatre, where we have only begun to identify the real problems and phases of learning in the discipline.

The tendency to depend on the assumptions of other disciplines and to imitate their practices in the classroom should, I think, be recognized as an inheritance of expediency, dating from the time when theatre was solely an extra-curricular activity: it was there to be done, not thought about. We can agree in large part with recommendations made in the recent special issues of the ETJ (on Actor Training, November 1966; on Theatre Research, June 1967; on Theatre Education and Development, August 1968), but until we have broadened our concept of research and investigation our field will not progress significantly as a unique discipline. We must declare its independence and support its integrity as a subject of study, exploring afresh its complex inter-relations. We must regard the theatre as theatre, and understand that it has much to teach us that we have not yet been able to learn.

The Development of Talent

These remarks have dealt variously with the problems of the teacher in theatre, with the purposes of play production in relation to the community theatre education serves, and with theatre as a subject of study in education. The fourth topic concerns the student. It is astonishing how little consideration has been given to issues in the development of talent by teachers of theatre and the arts. Indeed, theatre educators have a way of thinking more about the theatre and less about education--as the content of this convention's program proves--so there is reason to suspect that many have neglected to consider the topic with depth.

Previously I had the chance to voice some ideas on this matter, which were abstracted in the ETJ Special Issue of June 1967. I will take this opportunity to present these ideas in full.

We have no acknowledged pedagogical theory, no structured propositions that deal with the learning process of the theatre student and which affect our work accordingly. Such theory as we have is either implicit in what we do as teachers or is original with individuals, who can be imitated without an assurance that the elusive qualities leading to their success will transfer with imitation. The absence of such a body of acknowledged thought inhibits valid discussion of different policies of instruction.

Teachers of theatre and of the arts generally seem to share agreement on some characteristics of desirable students. What we hear said indicates certainly that we are more concerned to work with young people who possess a demonstrable degree of histrionic sense, an active imaginative faculty, and a capability for aesthetic apprehension than we are to recognize intellectual agility, shrewdness in perceiving logical relationships, and a gift for manipulating propositions.

We know the educational process in a student of theatre involves more than the appreciation and mastery of appropriate bodies of knowledge. It entails a vital development of the spiritual self as sense perceptions sharpen and the ability to express inner realizations becomes more viable. Without denying the usefulness of conventional knowledge to the theatre student, it is important to assert that the learning process in art can be effective only when meaningful self-development takes place.

Proceeding from this final generalization and drawing upon experience, I think we can describe the outline of successful development in a theatre student and therefrom determine the function of the teacher and the learning situation. This development seems to fall into four stages.

I would call the first of these stages <u>initiatory</u>. At this point in his experience the student is a neophyte making his first significant encounters with the art. These encounters provoke in him an intense self-awareness and a desire for fulfillment through participation. Lacking objectivity, his trial flights are unwittingly imitative; indeed, he thinks, conceives, and executes imitatively. But his efforts seem high adventure and are characterized by a fascination with himself in a new context. It is a period of vaultless dreams and fragile hopes, and precisely because this is so the student is easily distracted to other objects and occupations. Nonetheless, the profound interest remains; if adequate compensation attaches to the interest, the student may move to the next stage.

This would be the <u>formative</u> stage, in which our student is motivated to investigate the field and its possibilities for him. His viewpoint is still fundamentally subjective, but he is very receptive to outside influences and aware that he is absorbing them. His nebulous impressions of the discipline solidify in terms of acquired attitudes and strategies, which he seeks to apply tentatively. His work

at this point may be cautious for he is testing himself and would not relish failures. He tends to be a practical pragmatist, i.e., what "works" is right and good. His pattern of success begins to determine the professional directions he will take, if any, and at the end of this stage he can see himself as a practitioner in the art. He will not have forgotten his onetime dreams and hopes but they may have undergone extensive revision. If he survives this stage he will be hard to discourage.

Now comes the productive stage; the student is committed to the theatre and will seek a career in it. He believes he can be confident about the areas in which he will excel, so he wants to demonstrate his capabilities. An important thing happens: objectivity becomes an attribute of his efforts and he is more truly interested in the work of others than he has ever been. That is, he is consolidating his knowledge and personal experience to achieve particular ends. There is strength, order, and individuality in his thought and action, although he depends to a great extent on his peers and seniors whose estimation of him gains in value.

Finally, the creative stage. He can stand alone. The student is disciplined, which is to say he knows his limitations, and is involved in working out his style of expression. His work has true originality in its self-assertiveness; whereas earlier he might have shown dissatisfactions with inferior results, he can now assume a balanced posture that permits him to manage assessments with some detachment and less emotionality. Probably a skillful collaborator, he is ambitious and highly energetic in relation to the modus operandi of the organization or realm of the theatre in which he makes his contribution. Seeking out opportunities which appeal to him, he produces meaningful experiences for others by drawing upon the full extent of his experience and knowledge.

The objective of theatre education, I take it, is to help the student achieve the fourth stage. It follows, then, that the teacher's work is not simply to impart knowledge and nurture the pupil's individuality in the earlier stages, but to assist him in passing from one stage to another when he is ready. In fact, this is the teacher's most crucial responsibility. It requires an ability to recognize exactly how far the student has come and whether his resources will be adequate to take him further.

How does this formulation accord with conventional levels of instruction? Through discussion with many colleagues and after some experimental observation, I conclude that the stages of development do not necessarily coincide with our conventional grades and levels in education. The best student of theatre is very much an individualist, which means it is hazardous to predict at what point of development he will be at a given age, for example. On the other hand, our knowledge of behavior suggests what our experience as teachers confirms--that significant development of talent for the theatre will not commence until the student has weathered the storms of adolescence. Indeed, the description of the initiatory stage reads like an account of the adolescent and post-adolescent experience. Varying with the particular student, therefore, serious education and training for the theatre may begin sometime between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one.

The burden of developing talent, it seems, falls upon those teachers who work with the student at college age. The function of the teacher prior to that time must be to provide an aesthetic education without which serious training is impossible. Of course our creative dramatics people have been insisting on this for years.

Ideally, one might venture, the student passes from the initiatory to the formative stage in his early college or late high school career, the former being the most likely. Projecting further, the transition from the

formative to the productive stage should occur toward the end of a successful undergraduate program, and the last stage of development would be approached at the end of a genuine apprenticeship which might happen in the first level of graduate work but is more likely to occur after the student has left the campus to seek a career.

I have been told by psychologists that this outline of development, derived from observation, is consistent with their findings. (I had only heard of Bruner, Piaget, et al when first attempting to set this down.)

Efforts to employ such a theory of development runs into what amounts to a single standard of student evaluation in American education. I mean, for example, that the students in a junior class at college are now presumed to be at the same stage of development when that is patently not the case. In a class composed mostly of juniors that I taught last year, half of them were still in the first stage of development, a fourth had progressed into the formative stage, one person was clearly in the productive stage, and the remainder needed to major in something other than theatre. The massiveness of the educational establishment makes it impractical to fight it, but we don't have to join its fallacious assumptions about evaluation. I endeavored to employ a pluralistic standard of evaluation, frankly expecting much more from the one student in the advanced stage than from the others. (The grading system helps not at all, so the meaning of this expectation had to be conveyed to the students in other ways.) The vital point for the teacher to realize is to treat each student according to his status.

This is not the place to take up the further ramifications of a developmental theory of instruction for theatre education. Its presentation here may cause us to reflect upon our tendency as teachers to be subject-centered with-

out sufficient regard for the student's maturation and unconsciously created behavior and sensibilities. If we seriously propose to develop the talents of the young people who come to us, we must become student-centered when in contact with them.

Missionary Work

Spokesmen for theatre education have a way of encouraging us all by fixing hopefully on those events and instances where a clear responsiveness to the times stands out in provocative work which ought to inspire others to do likewise. If we are to think about all of theatre education, however, this is wishful thinking. The fact is that the pacesetters are more discussed than followed; in many of the self-contained situations of theatre in a school, innovations which should be closely heeded make no impact whatever. In an era noteable for tremendous changes in cultural dynamics, a great majority of programs in theatre education remain unaltered. That condition bespeaks a deeply vain self-admiration, simple naivete, or unexamined apathy.

Is this problem of a devitalized and unprogressive attitude--disturbingly prevalent--one which admits of some solution? Well, who's got the marbles in the education game? The institutional leadership. The prescription for this malady, then, is more missionary work.

The leaders of an educational institution at any level must finally accept the responsibility for the vitality and continuing self-renewal of the programs it offers. Their natural inclination may be to perpetuate and protect what they have gained, and maybe we can appreciate their concentration of energy to those ends. But their interest and concern in our work can be intensified.

Undoubtedly the leaders of a theatre program themselves have a responsibility to press for improvements and reforms, but the history of our discipline shows that this is to travel a very long road whose destination may be reached only after its original nature has changed. By contrast, the alacrity with which certain programs have been reconstituted in recent years can be readily traced to the institutional leadership. Administrators did not design the new formats, but they issued the call and gave the impetus. Where apathy exists, however, an influence from outside has to bear upon the situation, and individuals cannot do this missionary work alone. For this we must look to our organizations, regional and national, and strive to help them find the best means of persuasion.

To improve the lot of theatre education generally, we must make cause to enlighten the men in high administrative places in school systems, the community, the college or university, state and federal government. Our message should be that the theatre art is no mere enrichment of the educational process but a needed part of a complete education for the child, the adolescent, and the young adult. Sir Herbert Read has put it this way:

> Anxious as we rightly are in this age of technology to sustain the great tradition of liberal culture, we should nevertheless make sure that we do not in the process muddy with erudition and vain learning those crystal fountains from which flow our most essential creative energies. Those fountains are bedded in the human frame; they are the unpolluted rivers of perception and imagination. Education should therefore be conceived as primarily a cultivation of these sensuous activities, as <u>aesthetic</u> education.
>
> --Sir Herbert Read. <u>Icon and Idea</u> (Shocken), pp. 138-139.

Of the five problems I have offered suggestions about, this last one may be the easiest to define and the hardest to solve. Our capability to meet all of our problems may depend on our inventiveness in coping with this one.

With a greater sense of unity as to goals of theatre education that we can together pursue, a readiness to rely on each other, and a determination to stimulate the cooperation and assistance of resourceful colleagues in other disciplines, we can progress. Particularly if we can learn to think less compulsively as directors, actors, designers, playwrights, and technicians, and see our primary responsibility as educators, theatre education can make a memorable contribution to the theatre art and to the society whose image it projects in symbolic forms.